

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

IN RE HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
SHAREHOLDER DERIVATIVE
LITIGATION

Case No. 12-cv-06003-CRB (EDL)

THIS DOCUMENT RELATES TO:
ALL ACTIONS

**ORDER ON SHAREHOLDER
COPELAND'S MOTION TO SHORTEN
TIME**

Re: Dkt. No. 321

United States District Court
Northern District of California

On March 20, 2015, Shareholder Copeland filed a motion seeking an order for discovery in connection with the third amended and restated stipulation of settlement (“Discovery Motion”) and a motion to shorten time on the hearing of the Discovery Motion. On March 24, 2015, Defendant Hewlett-Packard Company (“Defendant HP”) opposed the motion to shorten time. The next day, Lead Plaintiff Stanley Morrical also opposed the motion.¹ Shareholder Copeland’s motion to shorten time violates Civil Local Rules 6-3(a)(4)(i) and 37-1(a), which require counsel to “have previously conferred for the purpose of attempting to resolve all disputed issues” prior to bringing a motion to shorten time on a discovery dispute. Furthermore, Defendant HP represents that it is willing to meet and confer with Shareholder Copeland and to respond to his document requests and interrogatories. (Dkt. 325-1 (Wolinsky Decl.) ¶¶ 11, 13.) Nevertheless, the Court is mindful of the time constraints identified in Shareholder Copeland’s motion. Therefore, Shareholder Copeland’s motion to shorten time is DENIED without prejudice to a renewed motion if counsel are unable to promptly meet and confer meaningfully, in good faith on the discovery

¹ Plaintiff Morrical’s opposition is untimely. See Civil Local Rule 6-3(b) (“a party who opposes a motion to enlarge or shorten time must file an opposition . . . no later than 4 days after receiving the motion”).

requests.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: March 25, 2015


ELIZABETH D. LAPORTE
United States Magistrate Judge

United States District Court
Northern District of California